



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/037,674	03/09/1998	HIDEKI MIZUHARA	2933SE-11-CI	7419
22442	7590	12/20/2005	EXAMINER	
SHERIDAN ROSS PC 1560 BROADWAY SUITE 1200 DENVER, CO 80202			NADAV, ORI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/037,674	MIZUHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ori Nadav	2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 25-27 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There is no support in the specification for a modified SOG film (i.e. an SOG film having no organic component) containing over 1% carbon, as recited in claim 25.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed limitations of a passivation layer covering top surfaces of the insulating film and the wirings, including a single modified SOG film, as recited in claim 25, are unclear as to which element includes the single modified SOG film.

The claimed limitation of a modified SOG film containing over 1% carbon, as recited in claim 25, is unclear as to how a modified SOG film (i.e. an SOG film having no organic component) can contain an organic component (carbon).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-27, insofar as in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano (JP 6-291202) in view of Ito et al. (5,270,259) and Okumura et al. (4,984,055).

Regarding claim 25, Nakano teaches in figure 1b and related text a semiconductor device comprising:

a semiconductor substrate 11,

an insulating film 12 on the substrate,

wirings 13 located on the insulating film 12 and

a passivation layer covering top surfaces of the insulating film and the wirings, including a single modified SOG film 15, wherein the modified SOG film contains boron impurity, and wherein the modified SOG film has relatively low hygroscopicity.

Nakano does not teach a modified SOG film containing over 1% carbon, and does not state that insulating film 12 is an interlayer insulating film.

Ito et al. teach that an SOG layer comprising an organic SOG and an inorganic SOG layers, and containing carbon (column 1, lines 17-27 and column 9, lines 28-33).

Okumura et al. teach in figure 13D an interlayer insulating film (ILD) 12 located between the semiconductor substrate 1 and wirings 16.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a modified SOG film containing over 1% carbon, and an interlayer insulating film as the insulating film in Nakano's device in order to utilize the advantages of both the organic and the inorganic SOG layer, and in order to provide good isolation between the wiring layers and the active regions in the semiconductor substrate, respectively.

Regarding claims 26-27, Nakano teaches in figure 1b and related text an insulating film 16 located on at least one of an upper side and lower side of the modified SOG film comprising silicon oxide and having a hygroscopicity lower than the modified SOG film. Although Nakano does not explicitly state that silicon oxide has a hygroscopicity lower than boron doped SOG, this feature is inherent in Nakano's device, because it is well known in the art that silicon oxide has a hygroscopicity lower than boron doped SOG, of which judicial notice is taken.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ori Nadav whose telephone number is 571-272-1660. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on 571-272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



O.N.
12/14/05

ORI NADAV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800